

REMARKS

The application is amended to place it in condition for allowance at the time of the next Official Action.

Claims 54-60 are pending in the application.

Claims 54-56, 58 and 60 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over ABE et al. 6,661,476 in view of SHIMADA et al. 6,448,578 and further in view of FUJIKAWA 6,414,738. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 54 is amended and recites that the TiN film is exposed at each terminal. See, for example, Figures 2A-2D, wherein the terminals 22, 23 are exposed. See also page 23, lines 3-11.

ABE, SHIMADA and FUJIKAWA fail to disclose or suggest an exposed terminal.

Rather, ABE discloses an insulating film 11, 20 over the scan line G and any terminal thereof. See Figure 4. SHIMADA discloses an insulating film 10, 11 over the multilayered structure 3a, 3b, 3c; see Figure 1 and FUJIKAWA discloses at least a transparent display electrode 12 over TiN films 14, 15. See Figure 5.

Moreover, ABE, SHIMADA and FUJIKAWA fail to disclose the advantages obtained by the above feature (i.e., a problem to be solved by the invention) to suppress the increase of the electrical connection resistance at the terminals of the lines and to improve the connection reliability at the terminals.

For at least this reason, the proposed combination of references does not suggest a need to expose the metal films (i.e.. the TIN films) that constitute the respective lines at their terminals, as recited in the present invention.

Therefore, the present invention is believed not to be obvious over these cited references.

Claim 57 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over ABE in view of SHIMADA and FUJIKAWA and further in view of NAKAMURA 6,096,572. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

NAKAMURA is only cited with respect to features of dependent claim 57. NAKAMURA does not overcome the shortcomings of the ABE/SHIMADA/FUJIKAWA combination set forth above with respect to claim 54. Since claim 57 depends from claim 54 and further defines the invention, claim 57 is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

Claim 59 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over ABE in view of SHIMADA and FUJIKAWA and further in view of MARIEB et al. 5,909,635. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

MARIEB is only cited with respect to features of dependent claim 59. MARIEB does not overcome the shortcomings of the ABE/SHIMADA/FUJIKAWA combination set forth above with respect to claim 54. Since claim 59 depends from claim 54 and further

defines the invention, claim 59 is believed to be patentable at least for depending from an allowable independent claim.

In view of the present amendment and the foregoing remarks, it is believed that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/Liam McDowell/

Liam McDowell, Reg. No. 44,231
209 Madison Street, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573

LM/lrs